



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/829,629	04/10/2001	W. Brent Lindquist	1079-3	7652

7590 10/01/2003

Jeffrey S. Steen  
DILWORTH & BARRESE, LLP  
333 Earle Ovington Boulevard  
Uniondale, NY 11553

EXAMINER

MAHATAN, CHANNING

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1631

//

DATE MAILED: 10/01/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/829,629

Applicant(s)

LINDQUIST ET AL.

Examiner

Channing S. Mahatan

Art Unit

1631

-- Th MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 July 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-48 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-48 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.  
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  
\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).  
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_ 6) ☐ Other:

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### *APPLICANTS' ARGUMENTS*

Applicants' arguments in Paper No. 10, filed 14 July 2003, have been fully considered but they are not deemed to be persuasive. Rejections and/or objections not reiterated from previous office actions are hereby withdrawn. The following rejections and/or objections are either reiterated or newly applied. They constitute the complete set presently being applied to the instant application.

### *CLAIMS UNDER EXAMINATION*

Claims herein under examination are claims 1-48.

### **Claims Rejected Under 35 U.S.C. § 112 1<sup>st</sup> Paragraph**

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. § 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

### *NEW MATTER*

Claims 1-17 and 43-48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Claims 1, 43-48, and all claims dependent therefrom are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph. The introduction of "repeating said processing module step for a plurality of microscopy images imaged over a sequence of time intervals and tracing each extracted neuronal

Art Unit: 1631

structure through a time-series of said images” in amended claim 1 (lines 5-7) and the addition of claims 43-48 in Paper No. 10, filed 14 July 2003, is considered new matter. Applicants have failed to provide support, page and line number, for all amended or newly added claims. Claims 43-48 encompass identification of cell structures not disclosed or contemplated within the specification (i.e. mitochondria, myelin sheath, etc). Therefore, the introduction of “repeating said processing module step for a plurality of microscopy images imaged over a sequence of time intervals and tracing each extracted neuronal structure through a time-series of said images” in claim 1 and all claims dependent therefrom, and newly added claims 43-48 is considered NEW MATTER.

#### **Claims Rejected Under 35 U.S.C. § 112 2<sup>nd</sup> Paragraph**

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. § 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 18-48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

#### ***VAGUE AND INDEFINITE***

Claim 18 and all claims dependent therefrom recite the step of “comparing the at least one characteristic to a corresponding at least one characteristic of a control neuron, thereby determining the effect of a substance on a neuron” implies a criteria/threshold value at which a substance is indicative of having an effect on a neuron. For example, if a characteristic of a neuronal structure of a neuron subjected to substance ‘X’ is determined (i.e. spine length value is 3) and the compared to a control neuron structure (i.e. spine length value is 2.9) is this indicative

Art Unit: 1631

of an effect on a neuron? What is the effect the substance has on the neuron? Clarification of the metes and bounds of the claim is requested via clearer claim wording.

Claim 43 and all claims dependent therefrom are indefinite due to the lack of clarity of the claim language failing to recite a final process step, which agrees back with the preamble. The preamble states that it is “a method for determining a structure by analyzing a microscopy image”, however the claim recites a final step of “repeating steps (a) through (e) for a plurality of points in time and tracing each said identified structure through a time-series of said images, wherein a sequence of each of said plurality of structures is imaged over a sequence of time intervals”. While minor details are not required in method/process claims, at least the basic step must be recited in a positive, active fashion. Clarification of the metes and bounds of the claim is requested via clearer claim wording.

### **Claims Rejected Under 35 U.S.C. § 102**

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. § 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-9 and 14-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated over Spacek et al. The rejection is maintained for reasons of record and with further clarification of the basis for rejection.

It is acknowledged that Spacek et al. does not explicitly state “automatic processing of images, which includes automatic recognition based on geometrical features of the neuronal structures” as asserted by Applicants in Paper No. 10, filed 14 July 2003. However, the claim

Art Unit: 1631

element(s) of “automatic recognition” would have been inherently apparent as described in Spacek et al. The following is a reiteration from the previous office action: “Utilizing PC-based software outlines of the plasma membrane, postsynaptic densities, mitochondria, and smooth endoplasmic reticulum were traced from stored and “live” images (instant claim 2; page 192, Columns 1-2, lines 6-10 and 1-4). Therefore, said element(s) of “automatic recognition” would have been inherently apparent in Spacek et al. per the PC-based software. It is noted that Applicants’ instant claims (i.e. claim 1) does not recite “automatic processing of images, which includes automatic recognition based on geometrical features of the neuronal structures”. Thus, Spacek et al. anticipates the claimed invention.

**No Claims Are Allowed.**

*ACTION IS FINAL, AS NECESSITATED BY AMENDMENT*

Applicants amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See M.P.E.P. § 706.07(a). Applicants are reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Art Unit: 1631

*EXAMINER INFORMATION*

Papers related to this application may be submitted to Technical Center 1600 by facsimile transmission. Papers should be faxed to Technical Center 1600 via the PTO Fax Center located in Crystal Mall 1. The faxing of such papers must conform with the notices published in the Official Gazette, 1096 OG 30 (November 15, 1988), 1156 OG 61 (November 16, 1993), and 1157 OG 94 (December 28, 1993) (See 37 C.F.R. § 1.6(d)). The CM1 Fax Center number is either (703) 308-4242 or (703) 305-3014.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Channing S. Mahatan whose telephone number is (703) 308-2380. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (8:30-5:00).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael P. Woodward, Ph.D., can be reached on (703) 308-4028.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to Legal Instruments Examiner, Tina M. Plunkett, whose telephone number is (703) 305-3524 or to the Technical Center receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0196.

Date:

*September 30, 2003*

Examiner Initials:

*CSM*

*Marianne P. Allen*  
MARIANNE P. ALLEN  
PRIMARY EXAMINER  
GROUP 1800

*A41631*